

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office

April 9, 1999

LB 608

probably explain it better than I can, but you've got to view the entire statute, and it almost...the Supreme Court has got some terminology they use in cases where they say you've got to look at the whole law to arrive at its intention. And I think that we can be assured that that would be done and that this problem of "to each week claimed" would not actually be the problem, and certainly should not be ever used to deny a valid claim under the statute, because the whole purpose in my bringing this law is to protect the unemployment compensation system. Because if we don't protect the system, then we undercut its support in business throughout the state. Last year Senator Hilgert brought, I think, LB 225, which actually put unemployment compensation on a good footing, keyed it into a gradual increase in benefits, to take care of inflation, set it up on a good, permanent basis. The Business and Labor Committee, of which you are a member, Senator Chambers, I think did an excellent job on that bill. I think this is just an extension of that to preserve the system so that employees who are laid off have their rights protected. And I would strongly urge the advancement of this bill in its present language.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Matzke. Senator Hartnett.

SENATOR HARTNETT: Would yield my time to Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Chambers, you have approximately five minutes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Senator Hartnett. And this will be my last time to speak on this bill. And, Senator Matzke, I think that term is *impari materia*, where all of the legislation on a particular issue, either old legislation, current legislation, would have to be read together to get the meaning of it. So you're absolutely right in that regard. And I do believe your intent is to make sure that unemployed workers are not deprived of any assistance to which they're entitled under the law. What I am saying is that the way I read this language is different from what Senator Matzke's goal is. I am not saying that, by prorating this amount out over the entire period for which a person claims unemployment compensation, I've used the three-month period, that by so doing the person could be denied coverage for all of the weeks in that